1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WA	SHINGTON AT TACOMA	
9	CLMS MANAGEMENT SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ROUNDHILL I, L.P.,	Case No.	
10	Plaintiffs,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
11	v.		
12	AMWINS BROKERAGE OF GEORGIA, LLC; AMRISC, LLC; C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC.; CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S,		
13	Defendants.		
14	Defendants.		
15	COMES NOW, Plaintiffs CLMS MANAG	GEMENT SERVICES LIMITED	
16	PARTNERSHIP and ROUNDHILL I, L.P. (collectively to hereinafter as "Plaintiffs") and		
17	alleges against Defendants AMWINS BROKERA	AGE OF GEORGIA, LLC; AMRISC, LLC;	
18	C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC.; CERTAIN UND	ERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S, LONDON,	
19	(collectively referred to hereinafter as "Defendan	ts") as follows:	
20	I. <u>PA</u>	RTIES	
21	1.1 Plaintiff CLMS MANAGEMENT	SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP is a	
22	Washington Limited Partnership with its principle place of business in Graham, Washington.		
23	1.2 Plaintiff ROUNDHILL I, L.P. is a Washington Limited Partnership with its		
24	principle place of business in Graham, Washingto	on.	
	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 1 Case No	HOLMES WEDDLE & BARCOTT, PC 999 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 2600	

HOLMES WEDDLE & BARCOTT,
999 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 2600
SEATTLE, WA 98104-4011
TELEPHONE (206) 292-8008
FAX (206) 340-0289

- 1.3 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that at all relevant times Defendant AMWINS BROKERAGE OF GEORGIA, LLC was a North Carolina limited liability corporation with its principle place of business in Atlanta, Georgia.
- 1.4 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that at all relevant times Defendant AMRISC, LLC was a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principle place of business in Houston, Texas.
- 1.5 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that at all relevant times Defendant C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC. was a Florida Corporation with its principle place of business in Orlando, Florida.
- 1.6 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that at all relevant times Defendant CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S, LONDON was a British business entity with its principle place of business in London, England.

## II. <u>JURISDICTION AND VENUE</u>

- 2.1 Federal diversity jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1332. Complete diversity of citizenship exists between the parties and the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.
- 2.2 Venue in the Western District of Washington at Tacoma is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events or omissions on which the claims asserted herein are based occurred in this District and the subject contract was executed in this District.

## III. FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

3.1 At all relevant times, and in relation to all causes of action, each Defendant was serving as an agent for each of the other Defendants.

23

	ı <b>İ</b>
1	3.2
2	residential c
3	CLMS MAN
4	ROUNDHII
5	3.3
6	Defendant A
7	"Policy").
8	3.4
9	broker which
10	3.5
11	3.6
12	number AM
13	3.7
14	– August 30
15	3.8
16	by Hurrican
17	3.9
18	3.10
19	inquiries we
20	3.11
21	alleging a de
22	3.12
23	To date, the
	ıl

3.2	Roundhill Townhomes (referred to hereinafter as "Roundhill") is a multifamily
esidential	complex containing sixteen buildings which is operated and managed by Plaintiff
CLMS MA	NAGEMENT SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, and owned by Plaintiff
ROUNDH	П.І.І.Р

- 3.3 On September 16, 2016, Plaintiffs entered into an insurance contract through Defendant AMRISC, LLC regarding the Roundhill property (referred to hereinafter as the 'Policy').
- 3.4 Defendant AMWINS BROKERAGE OF GEORGIA, LLC was an insurance broker which assisted in the placement of the policy.
  - 3.5 C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC. was a claims administrator for the insurers.
- 3.6 Defendant CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S, LONDON (certificate number AMR-39768-02) are underwriters on the subject policy.
- 3.7 The policy provided coverage for the Roundhill property from August 30, 2016August 30, 2017.
- 3.8 On or about August 27, 2017, seven of the Roundhill buildings were damaged by Hurricane Harvey. Damages are currently estimated at a combined \$5,660,000.
  - 3.9 Plaintiffs made a claim under the Policy.
- 3.10 At various times, Plaintiffs made inquiries concerning the claim and these inquiries were not timely or properly responded to.
- 3.11 On May 24, 2018, Defendant C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC. issued a letter alleging a deductible of \$3,600,000 (hereinafter referred to as the "Deductible Letter").
- 3.12 On July 16, 2019, a letter was sent by Plaintiffs' counsel concerning the claim. To date, there has been no substantive response to that letter.

1	IV.	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF CONTRACT (INSURANCE
2		<u>CONTRACT)</u>
3	4.	Plaintiffs reassert the allegations contained in paragraphs $1.1 - 3.12$ .
4	4.	The Deductible Letter issued by Defendant C.J.W. & ASSOCIATES, INC.
5	alleges th	at the deductible under the policy is \$3,600,000. Under the Policy, the deductible
6	should be	\$600,000, not \$3,600,000.
7	4.	As a result of Defendants' breach of contract, the Plaintiffs suffered, and
8	continues	to suffer, damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
9	V.	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE POLICY
10		<u>CHANGES</u>
11	5.	Plaintiffs reassert the allegations contained in paragraphs $1.1 - 4.3$ .
12	5.	2 Plaintiffs had previously insured the property with Defendants and certain
13	changes	vere allegedly made in the subject policy. These changes were not communicated to
14	the Plain	iffs and are, therefore, ineffective.
15	VI.	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – UNFAIR CLAIMS HANDLING PRACTICES
16	6.	Plaintiffs reassert the allegations contained in paragraphs $1.1 - 5.2$ .
17	6.	2 Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of unfair claims settlement
18	practices	under WAC 284-30-330.
19	6.	Defendants violated WAC 284-30-360 by failing to acknowledge pertinent
20	commun	cations from Plaintiff within the prescribed time periods under Washington
21	regulatio	ns.
22	6.	Defendants failed to reasonably construe the Policy or investigate the claim.
23	6.	Defendants failed to act with Plaintiffs in good faith.
24		
	CONTRE	HOLMER WEDDLE & DADGOWE DC

1	VII. <u>PRAYER</u>
2	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as
3	follows:
4	1. That Plaintiffs may have judgment on ALL CAUSES OF ACTION for general,
5	and special damages and all other allowable damages according to proof at trial, in excess of
6	\$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs;
7	2. The Plaintiffs may have judgment on ALL CAUSES OF ACTION for
8	reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof at trial;
9	3. The Plaintiffs may have judgment on ALL CAUSES OF ACTION for pre-
10	judgment and post-judgment interest in an amount according to proof at trial and the law; and
11	4. That Plaintiffs be awarded such other and further relief as this Honorable Court
12	deems just and proper.
13	DATED this <u>23<sup>rd</sup></u> day of August, 2019.
14	HOLMES WEDDLE & BARCOTT, P.C.
15	/s/ Michael A. Barcott
16	Michael A. Barcott, WSBA #13317
17	/s/ Daniel P. Barcott Daniel P. Barcott, WSBA #50282
18	999 Third Avenue, Suite 2600 Seattle, Washington 98104
19	Telephone: 206-292-8008 Facsimile: 206-340-0289
20	Email: <u>mbarcott@hwb-law.com</u> <u>dbarcott@hwb-law.com</u>
21	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
22	G:\5783\29589 - Roundhill\Pleading\Complaint.docx
23	
24	